# EXHIBIT 4 FILED UNDER SEAL

## Russell-Schreiber CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EXES ONLY of 13/10/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY			
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA			
3	x			
4	FAIR ISAAC CORPORATION,			
5				
6	Plaintiff, v. Court File No.			
	16-cv-1054 (WMW/DTS)			
7	FEDERAL INSURANCE COMPANY			
8	and ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY,			
9	Defendants.			
10				
11	X			
12	***CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY***			
13	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUSSELL SCHREIBER			
14	New York, New York			
15	Wednesday, October 24, 2018			
16	8:52 a.m.			
17	7			
18				
19				
20				
21	Departed by			
22	Reported by: LYNN VAN DEN HENDE			
23	CRR, RMR, RPR, CSR-NY, CSR-CA, CSR-IL JOB NO: 39215			
24				
25	25			

## Russell Schreiber CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' FYES ONLY of 13/0/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
2	
3	
4	October 24, 2018
5	8:52 a.m.
6	
7	Videotaped deposition of RUSSELL
8	SCHREIBER, held at the offices of Merchant &
9	Gould, 767 Third Avenue, 23rd Floor, New
10	York, New York, pursuant to Notice, before
11	Lynn Van Den Hende, Certified Realtime
12	Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter, State
13	of New York Certified Shorthand Reporter,
14	State of California Certified Shorthand
15	Reporter, State of Illinois Certified
16	Shorthand Reporter, Registered Professional
17	Reporter, and Notary Public within and for
18	the State of New York.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
1	

#### Russell Schreiber GONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EXES ONLY of 130/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

```
CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
1
2
    APPEARANCES:
3
4
    FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
5
         Merchant & Gould
          3200 IDS Center
7
          80 South Eighth Street
8
         Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2215
9
          612-332-5300
10
                ALLEN W. HINDERAKER, ESQ.
          BY:
11
                ahinderaker@merchantgould.com
12
13
    FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
14
          FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.
15
          200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000
16
          Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425
17
          612-492-7000
18
         BY:
                LEAH C. JANUS, ESQ.
19
                ljanus@fredlaw.com
20
    ALSO PRESENT:
21
22
          JAMES WOODWARD, Fair Isaac Corporation
23
          KEVIN S. MURPHY, Chubb
24
          KEVIN MARTH, Videographer
25
```

## Russell Schreiber CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EXES ONLY 10/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed	lei a	
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	works, right?	2	maybe March of '16.
3	Q. As part of your responsibilities	3	So within a month or two we
4	as client partner would you also generally be	4	received an RFI, and I led the response.
5	familiar with the licenses that governed the	5	MR. HINDERAKER: Can I I think
6	relationships with the clients that you	6	you said '16? February
7	worked with?	7	A. Oh, I meant '6. Did I say '16?
8	A. So generally, yes.	8	I meant 2006. Thank you.
9	But there were licenses that folks	9	Q. So you said you received an RFI in
10	had that I didn't even know, I wasn't even	10	the spring of 2006?
11	aware of.	11	A. Right. I want to say February or
12	Q. But generally the scope of the	12	March. So early late winter, early
13	license with a given client was something	13	spring, yeah. It was right away.
14	that you were familiar with?	14	Q. And what is an RFI?
15	A. Or I had to figure it out.	15	A. It could have been an RFP, but it
16	But, yes, yeah, sure.	16	was request for information would be an RFI.
17	Q. And that would be important for	17	It might have been an RFP, a
18	what you are doing as a client partner, I	18	request for proposal.
19	take it, because you need to know whether	19	But it was a document that we
20	there are additional products or services	20	received to be able to present to Chubb a
21	that could be sold to a given client,	21	solution and pricing and an approach to the
22	correct?	22	problem.
23	A. At one end or or if that	23	Q. And do you recall it was a
24	product was being sunset and they needed to	24	while ago, but do you recall off the top of
25	know that it was being, you know, shelved in	25	your head just generally what the nature of
	Page 20		Page 22
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	two years, that we can up and manage their	2	the request for information or proposal was
3	their way through that process.	3	from Chubb?
4	Q. Yeah. And you would also need to	4	A. Oh, yeah, yeah. Yeah. It's
5	know how widely that client is able to use	5	funny no, it's funny how things you
6	the software that they've licensed under the	6	remember.
7	terms of their license, correct?	7	Anyway so so this was to create
8	A. Say that again, please.	8	an automated renewals platform for their
9	Q. You'd also need to know how widely	9	specialty lines of business.
10	that client is able to use the software that	10	They had like a I forget, like
11	they've licensed under the term of their	11	170 or maybe 120 different products in
12	license?	12	that in that business.
13	A. Right. So if you mean do you	13	And so that would be like small
14	mean like what the scope of the license is?	14	manufacturers maybe or nurses or, you know,
15	Q. Yeah.	15	plumbers.
16	A. Because "widely" is I'm not	16	But what they called specialty
17	sure yeah, so if you said I would	17	lines.
18	certainly want to read the scope of the	18	And so the way they sold those
19	license, yeah, yeah. I guess.	19	products is they have the underwriting
20	Q. When did you first begin to work	20	process where they'd have an underwriter like
21	with Chubb?	21	price out how risky is this thing and then
22	A. Chubb was my first client. Chubb	22	set out an insurance price premium.
23	was my my entrée into FICO. That's you	23	And what was happening is they had
24	know, put me on the map.	24	a corporate initiative. Their agenda was to
25	So that would have been February,	25	be able to sell to a larger market, which
	Page 21		Page 23

## Russell Schreiber CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EXES ONLY of 13/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed	iera	ii insurance Company, et al.
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	meant smaller value, smaller dollar value.	2	touch, no touch.
3	So like I forget the numbers,	3	So if they had the high touch
4	but I want to say the average policy price	4	once were the most expensive ones to renew,
5	was maybe let's call it \$100,000 for this	5	because you had to go send people out, look
6	discussion.	6	at the buildings, you know you know, check
7	They wanted to be able to move	7	the headcount, make sure the staff is right.
8	down to a bigger market, more prospective	8	So it's how do you price that
9	customers.	9	premium.
10	Say the average policy is \$20,000.	10	Whereas the no touch, it's like
11	So, you know, moving to like the Fortune 100s	11	our auto insurance. You just get a new bill
12	to the Fortune 10,000, that kind of concept.	12	for the next year, right?
13	The way their business worked at	13	So they were trying to get more
14		14	into the low to no touch.
15	policy, they'd get a new prospect, and they'd	15	Q. And for folks who aren't familiar
16		16	with either the insurance industry or Blaze.
17	And then they would if they won	17	can you describe in general terms how a
18	the work, they'd book the policy, and they'd	18	product like Blaze would be used in a
19	have a new customer.	19	solution like this?
20	The problem was that on renewals	20	A. Sure.
	they would do a full review of the each	21	So insurance policies are annual
21			·
22	policy, so that it was effectively	22	policies. So about three months before the
23	underwriting the whole customer from scratch,	23	end of a year the policy information and the
24	, ,	24	claim information would be would be
25	So the premise of this RFI or RFP	25	transferred, be fed into a Blaze engine.
	Page 24		Page 26
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
	or request for a pitch was or solution was	2	And the Blaze software would look
	how can they automate the underwriting the	3	at that information. And rules would be
	renewal process so that they could move into	4	rules in Blaze would be applied to it.
5	a business model where they were had less	5	So the rule a rule might be,
6	•		oh, there were no claims this year. So that
7	So they're going to be some	7	means we could do a low or no touch.
8	insurance customers that would just, you	8	Or they had claims this year, so
9	know, not even touch this, just automatically	9	now it must be a high touch.
10	renew it.	10	And the magic here was that
11	There were others I think that	11	Blaze the rules that we're talking about
12	were high risk. They need to really do full	12	were set up in such a way that human beings
13	underwriting. There were some that were in	13	could could maintain them.
14	the middle.	14	So it didn't require like some,
15	So they called that the low touch,	15	you know, MIT Ph.D.
16	no touch, high touch is you know, and it's	16	A regular business analyst could
17	become pretty big in the industry now.	17	maintain those business rules.
18	Q. And the idea was this renewal	18	So right, so once a year a feed
19	process would become a low touch?	19	would come in, rules would be compared.
20	A. So they would be able to segment	20	And then the policies would be
21	the customers across these 170 or 200 plus	21	segmented into high touch, low touch, no
22	products. And, again, don't quote me on the	22	touch.
23	product count, but there was hundreds of	23	Q. And I take it that in a process
24	them. They could segment the customers at	24	like that while Blaze is involved Blaze is
	the renewal process into high touch, low	25	actually incorporated somehow into an
	Page 25		Page 27
	. 490 20	1	. 490 27

## Russell Schreiber CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EXES ONLY of 13/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed	_	
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	
2	the scope of the license	2	of negotiation, people involved.
3	A. Oh, yeah.	3	So you had the Blaze salespeople
4	Q that was being negotiated?	4	dealing with procurement.
5	A. Yeah, absolutely. Yeah, yeah.	5	But in terms of how much and
6	Q. What do you recall about those	6	what's the scope, it was really between Owen
7	discussions?	7	and I. And his boss at some point got
8	A. Right. So the initial license was	8	involved.
9	very much desired to be for specialty lines,	9	Q. And so you said "ELA." That
10	which is U.S. business, right? Specialty	10	stands for enterprise license agreement?
11	U.S.	11	A. Yes.
12	As we got to contracting it became	12	Q. Okay. And with respect to Chubb,
13	apparent they couldn't get the deal done for	13	was your understanding that that essentially
14	the June 30 window that they had talked	14	allowed Chubb to use Blaze throughout its
15	about.	15	enterprise?
16	So we broke out an expansion to	16	A. Chubb we have to be careful
17	include the specialty division, and then for	17	what Chubb is, because Chubb's a messy
18	the rest of the U.S. business.	18	organization. I mean that in a in a in
19	If they did if they you	19	a subjective way.
20	know so they had I want to say it was a	20	I just mean like there's a lot of
21	May June May June 30 would have been	21	organizational lines and overlap.
22	the first license signature for the named	22	So so from the Chubb Insurance
23	application of CSI underwriting, or something	23	level down, Chubb & Sons, policy I'm
24	like that, whatever the name was. I'm sure	24	sorry, personal lines, commercial lines,
25	you have the contract. You can look it up.	25	specialty lines, and the claims, those were
	Page 32		Page 34
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	Then somewhere over the summer it	2	the operating business units under Chubb &
3	would have been an expansion to be a CSI	3	Sons as we understood it at that time.
4	divisional license.	4	And it was very much U.S. focused.
5	So that would be that would	5	Q. Was the license the enterprise
6	exclude personal lines, commercial lines,	6	license that was ultimately negotiated
7	claims business, any corporate overhead.	7	however a global enterprise license?
8	It was just literally within that	8	A. No, no. There was rumor of that.
9	specialty lines business.	9	But, no.
10	And then they had an option to buy	10	Q. Okay. Did you ever understand it
11	out by the calendar year end I think it	11	to be a global enterprise license?
12	was calendar year end in ELA for the	12	A. No, no.
13	rest I'm sorry, for commercial, personal	13	I may have had a hiccup once or
14	lines and claims, which we called it	14	twice where people I've had people read
15	basically an enterprise license.	15	parts of agreements. Let's say, oh, they
16	Q. All right. And were you	16	haven't read the whole agreement and say it's
17	involved I guess describe your role in	17	global.
18	negotiating or discussing the scope of those	18	And I'd just correct them and say,
19	licenses as they were	19	no, I was there. It was not global.
20	A. Yeah. So I was the face. I was	20	And I'd get an email that would
	the guy.	21	say, oh, it's global. And I'd make some
22	So it was I led FICO. And then	22	committing moments where I didn't really
23	on the other side was Owen Williams for	23	refer back to the documents. I might have
	Chubb.	24	
25	Again, there were multiple layers	25	But I never, ever told Chubb it
	Page 33		Page 35
	39 00	1	- 9

## Russell-Schreiber CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EXES ONLY of 13/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	ran isaac Corporation vs. Fed	161 2	ii insurance Company, et ai.
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	was global. I've never had a contract that	2	A. Of course we really got to
3	said it was global, so	3	remember so we went into this thing
4	And I woke up every day thinking	4	selling a named application for for
5	this was a U.S. license.	5	renewals.
6	Q. So	6	It was very much went in with a
7	A. 'Cause global is all after the	7	very specific problem to solve and very
8	fact. This was U.S. They asked for global	8	specific solution to that problem.
9	as a contract renewal. But it was after the	9	And then while we were in there we
10	pricing was all set. We had the three steps	10	gave them options to expand their use.
11	in the contract.	11	Q. Were you aware that Chubb in
12	So they didn't really talk about	12	Europe was using Blaze pursuant to the ELA?
13	global till till the end of the	13	A. I did become aware at some point,
14			yes.
	pull the trigger on the enterprise license.	15	But it was never really clear to
	We didn't price it that way.		me that there maybe it was clear. I don't
16	Q. So they didn't talk about global		remember now because it's been a few years
17	until until after the enterprise license		since I've looked at this.
18	·	18	
19	was entered into or while the enterprise	19	But there was talk of them using
20	license was being negotiated?	20	it for development to try it out, proof of
21	A. So the enterprise license was	21	•
22	negotiated in prior to June of '6, right?	22	But I don't recall ever did
23	So June 30 that pricing, I'm	23	they use it in anchor for running their
24	pretty sure we had the three steps in the	24	business, you know.
25	agreement.	25	So I just don't recall. We can
	Page 36		Page 38
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	I haven't looked at this in a	2	look. I'm sure I'm sure in your stack
3	couple years now, right? I'd be interested	3	we'll see something that says something
4	to see if it has the three steps in the	4	there.
5	agreement.	5	Q. So you just don't recall whether
6	And that was very much U.S., as we	6	you were aware that Chubb Europe was using
7	were I don't recall exactly when, but I	7	Blaze?
8	believe as they were getting ready to sign	8	A. No, I know that I recall that
9	the the or pull the trigger or they	9	they had their hands on it.
10	gave us the word that they want to move to	10	I don't recall that it was used in
11	the enterprise, global came up.	11	production.
12	And and either Owen or Mark	12	So what I mean by that is they
13	brought it up to me and said, we didn't price	13	could have used it to test out ideas, to
14	global. And so it kind of came up. And it	14	for proof of concepts that were not used in
15	got put back down.	15	the actual running of their business.
16	Q. And that would have close to	16	Does that make sense?
17	the or in the December	17	Q. (Nodding.)
18	A. It would have been in '06.	18	A. Okay.
19	Q. Right. And so I'm just trying to	19	Q. Did you
20		20	A. And I just don't remember when I
21	it up late, towards the end of 2006?		became aware.
22	A. To me.	22	Q. Okay. So it's
23	Q. Okay.	23	A. I know I was aware at the end. I
24	A. Right.		just don't remember how how far from then.
25	Q. And then	25	Q. And by "the end" you mean
23		23	
1	Page 37	1	Page 39

## Russell Schreiber CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EXES ONLY of 13/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed	era	ar insurance Company, et al.
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	Q. You said you couldn't remember.	2	decision was made about what position FICO
3	A. Right.	3	would take with respect to whether the Chubb
4	Q. And so my question my follow-up	4	Blaze ELA was global?
5	question to you was it's possible then that	5	A. Do I recall? No.
6	in November 2008 after going through an	6	Q. As you sit here today, do you
7	internal analysis of the Chubb ELA you	7	
8	concluded that it was in fact a global ELA?	8	the Chubb Blaze ELA as a global ELA?
9	MR. HINDERAKER: And my objection	9	A. No, 'cause we'd have an
10	is lack of foundation, asks for	10	amendment we'd an Amendment Four that said
11	speculation.	11	it's global. And we don't have that. Or
12	A. But I still answer the question	12	
13	anyway.	13	Q. Do you believe that FICO
14	MR. HINDERAKER: Yes, the best you	14	allowed knowingly allowed Chubb to use the
15	can.	15	Blaze ELA outside of the United States?
16	A. Okay. So it's I'm sorry, one	16	A. Knowingly allowed how do you
17	more time is it possible that I concluded	17	mean that?
18	that it was a global ELA?	18	Just so I'm wondering, you
19	I'd state that all things are	19	know, before the fact or after the fact kind
20	possible.	20	of. So do we knowingly say, go ahead and use
21	Is it possible in the moment that		it?
22	with Larry saying yeah, yeah, yeah,	22	Q. Yeah.
23	yeah, yeah, I might have said, okay, maybe.	23	A. No.
24	And then I would have done the	24	We might have found out about
	rest of the work to find out what I really	25	something and said, you know what, don't
	Page 136		Page 138
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	thought.	2	break the relationship. It's a good
3	So it's possible in a moment, in a		customer. It's a small use. Let it go for a
4	flash I might have said, okay, maybe you're		while till it becomes important.
	right.	5	Q. Okay. So in your view
	Q. Okay. Now, presumably these	6	A. But that would have been we'd
7	conversations were taking place because Chubb	7	not
	Europe wanted to use Blaze, right?	8	Q. So in your view you don't believe
9	A. Or that's one possible	9	that Chubb ever said to I'm sorry, strike
10	that's one possible reason.	10	that.
11	Q. Okay. Or FICO	11	You don't believe that FICO ever
12	A sell it to	12	said to Chubb, go ahead and use it in Europe?
13	THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me,	13	Is that part correct?
14	excuse me. You need to speak one at a	14	A. That is correct.
15	time.	15	Q. But you think it's possible that
16	So what was the question?	16	FICO knew that Chubb was using it in Europe
17	Q. Or that FICO Europe wanted to sell	17	and made a decision not to take steps to stop
18	Blaze to Chubb Europe, that's another	18	Chubb from using it in Europe?
19	possibility for the reason for the	19	MR. HINDERAKER: I'll object to
20	conversation, correct?	20	the form of the question as asking for
21	A. Correct.	21	speculation.
22	Q. Do you recall what precipitated	22	A. I'm sorry, so I believed do I
23	the conversation?	23	believe that they I could have learned
24	A. No.	24	that they were using it and said, don't rock
25	Q. In any event, do you recall that a	25	the boat, Chubb's a great customer, we love
	Page 137		Page 139

## Russell Schreiber 1 CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' FYES ONLY of 19/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed	iera	ar msurance Company, et al.
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	their reference, it's a small use, it's not	2	as Exhibit 117.
3	material? It's possible.	3	A. David Taylor.
4	That would be something that	4	Q. After you've had a chance to look
5	would be a decision I would have made, say	5	at this, let me know.
6	don't rock it's not material, if it was a	6	(Document review.)
7	minor use for like a concept idea. But,	7	A. Okay.
8	yeah.	8	Q. All right. So if we start at the
9	Q. Okay. And so in that case in your	9	first in time email, which is on the back
10	mind you were knowingly allowing Chubb to use	10	A. Okay. First in time email.
	the Blaze software outside of the scope of	11	Q. That's from David Taylor to Ian
12	the license?		Brodie and you
13	MR. HINDERAKER: Object to the	13	A. Uh-huh.
14	guestion to the extent it asks for a	14	Q and others?
	·	15	Do you think lan Brodie would have
15	legal conclusion.  Also misstates his prior		-
16	·		been the client partner for Chubb at this
17	testimony. You.		time?
18	Can try to answer the question the	18	A. Yes.
19	best you can.	19	Q. Do you know where Ian Brodie is
20	A. I'm sorry, give me the question		now?
21	again.	21	A. He's running tattoo removal
22	Q. In that case you were knowingly	22	parlors in Boston.
23	allowing Chubb to use the Blaze software	23	You don't get to say that often,
24	outside of the scope of the license?	24	, , , , ,
25	MR. HINDERAKER: Same objections.	25	don't know where he is now.
	Page 140		Page 142
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	Go ahead.	2	Q. Okay. And did you say he's
3	A. I knowingly I may have known.	3	running them or
4	I don't know that I know that I	4	A. Right.
5	knew that I know, you know.	5	Q. Like he actually works in
6	Q. It's possible you can't recall	6	A. No, he owns he owns a string of
7	whether you knew, but it's possible?	7	laser removals. Apparently a very big
8	A. It's possible	8	business.
9	MR. HINDERAKER: Objection, asks	9	Q. Okay. And in the Boston area?
10	for speculation. Go ahead.	10	A. I believe so, yes.
11	A. It's it's	11	Q. Okay. To your knowledge, he's not
12	MR. HINDERAKER: Anything is	12	in the industry anymore?
13	possible. Go ahead.	13	A. That's right.
14	A. Right. It's certainly possible.	14	Q. Okay. And then David Taylor, who
15	It's possible I knew that they had	15	is that? Have we
16		16	A. David Taylor would have been an
17	letter of the law for a moment.	17	
18	Q. Or the letter of the license?	18	Alliance is between ACN is
19	A. That's what I meant, yeah, letter		
20	of license, yeah. Or the spirit of the	20	Q. Okay.
21	license, quite frankly.	21	A. All right. So we had business
22	(Exhibit 117, Email dated	22	relationships with Accenture where we would
23	6/3/2009, Bates FICO0003146 through	23	help them, they would help us.
	FICO0003147, marked for identification.)	24	You know, it's an alliance. It's
24			
25	Q. I'm showing you what's been marked	25	a teaming agreement. So David Taylor and Bob
	Page 141		Page 143

#### Russell Schreiber 1 CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY of 19/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed		
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	A. Right.	2	Q. And then documents showing that in
3	Q and I would probably have said,	3	fact Chubb was using Blaze in Europe.
4	no, which that does involve whether Chubb can	4	So do you think a reasonable
5	use Blaze in Europe. That's why I'm	5	person could look at those documents and
6	confused.	6	conclude that the conclusion at the time was
7	A. Okay.	7	the ELA allows Chubb to use Blaze in Europe?
8	Q. Do you recall is it that you	8	A. No.
9	don't recall the conversation	9	Why, you ask? I don't know that
10	A. Yeah, so	10	that meeting ever took place.
11	Q. You're just guessing?	11	I don't see any meeting notes. I
12	A. So Richard just called me and	12	don't see any conclusions.
13	said, can we sell them Blaze.	13	There's usually a meeting, agenda,
14	And I'd say, I think so. Let's	14	minutes, who attended, what the decisions
15	check the contract.	15	were. I haven't seen that there.
16	And I'd get an email exchange	16	So if you showed me an invite
17	would go here. It would be a little bit	17	Q. Where would the meeting agenda be
18	different.	18	kept?
19	Then Mike would go and pull up	19	A. I don't know. Whoever set up the
20	he'd pull up Amendment Three instead of	20	meeting.
21	oh, it looks like they have a global 'cause	21	So who set up this meeting? This
22	there's no territory.	22	was a
23	And we'd say we'd go back, we'd	23	Q. Mike Sawyer.
24	churn around on this stuff.	24	A. So it would be in the meeting
25	But at the end of the day the	25	invite, or it would be a separate document.
	Page 184		Page 186
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	agreement was the agreement	2	Q. When you referred to notes from a
3	was the agreement.	3	meeting like this, what type of notes would
4	And so if I missed or if I let	4	you generally expect to see?
5	them off the hook on a small usage, it didn't	5	A. I would see a conclusion.
6	change the nature of the agreement, that I	6	You know, attendees meeting,
7	never signed anything that gave them a global	7	meeting notes, right.
8	ELA, ever.	8	So who attended the meeting, what
9	Q. But you let them use Blaze in	9	the topic was, what were the outcomes.
10	Europe?	10	Q. And who would you have expected in
11	A. It looks like I did. I may have.	11	connection with 73 would have kept those
12	I don't recall doing so.	12	notes?
13	I certainly didn't get asked and I	13	A. 73, either probably Mike. It
14	certainly didn't say, go ahead.	14	could have been lan.
15	I may have found out about a use	15	In this case Mike was oh, yeah,
16	after the fact.	16	so, Mike. Who set up the meeting? Here,
17	I never if you show me	17	from Sawyer. So he would have likely taken
18	something that says, go right ahead and use	18	the notes.
19	it, I'll be surprised.	19	But it could have been lan. lan
20	Q. Well, I've shown you documents	20	was big on taking the notes. Ian was a big
21	from November of 2008 in which Richard Hill	21	believer whoever had the pen had the
22	is involved and the topic to be discussed is	22	outcome.
23	the Chubb license agreement and the plan for	23	Q. And in your experience what would
24	Chubb Europe.	24	happen to those notes after the meeting?
125	A. Right.	25	A. They should have been shared.
25			
25	Page 185		Page 187

## Russell Schreiber 1 CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY of 19/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed	lera	u insurance Company, et ai.
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	A. Okay.	2	A. Not from this. Not from this.
3	Q. Showing you what's been marked as	3	Q. Okay.
4	Exhibit 120.	4	A. Yeah.
5	(Exhibit 120, Email dated April	5	Q. Why is that?
6	14, 2014, with attachment, Bates	6	A. 'Cause I just forwarded this.
7	FICO0057223 through FICO0057227, marked	7	Someone else said, you know, Mike
8	for identification.)	8	give me this stuff, give me the projects
9	A. Oh, from me.	9	Chubb's working on. He gave it to me, and I
10	Q. This is an email from you dated	10	forwarded it on.
11	April 2014.	11	So chances are I didn't read this,
12	(Document review.)	12	by the way. So this does not tell me that I
13	Q. Do you recall sending this email?	13	was aware of their projects.
14	A. No. But I could have easily.	14	Q. Okay. Do you take the position
15	Oh, I just forwarded an email	15	you were not aware of Chubb's use of Blaze
16	though. I see. Okay. I'm forwarding an	16	in Chubb Europe's use of Blaze in 2014?
17	email, okay.	17	A. In 2014 yeah, I do. I don't
18	Q. And so you're forwarding it to		recall it.
19	Marlene Zimmerling, Andrew DiStefano.	19	So this this Exhibit 57 where
20	Who are they?	20	it says they've got global or whatever it is,
21	A. So those would be the Larry Wachs	21	I would have thought maybe from then they
22	and Dale Zwizinski of today, of that time	22	started using it, 'cause, again, I told them
23	period oh, I'm sorry, sales Blaze	23	here that it looks like they have a global,
	salesperson and Blaze sales engineer	24	right? Whatever that was, exhibit whatever.
	respectively.	25	So they may have started using it
	Page 212		Page 214
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	Q. And do you recall why it is that		then in earnest by mistake.
	you're sending them information about Chubb	3	Q. When you say "by mistake," you
	contacts and projects summary around April of		mean you just
	2014?	5	A. I was mistaken. I didn't do my
	A. Specifically, no.		homework and pull up the contracts and look
7	But they were new hires around		at it. Someone said.
	that time. And it would have been a welcome		Q. Okay. So you just assumed it was
1	to FICO and here's Chubb, is my suspicion.	8	global?
	Q. And attached to the email is a		A. Yeah.
10	couple of slides.	10	Q. Okay. And that was the first time
12	The second page of the slides		you assumed it was global?
		13	A. Yeah.
13	reads, "Chubb Blaze Projects."		
14	Do you see that?  A. I do see that.	14	In fact I'm surprised I assumed it
15		15	was global ever. You know, you surprised me
16	Q. And "Chubb International" is	16	that I actually said it was global to anyone
	listed?	17	ever, so but obviously I said it.
18	A. I do see that.	18	Q. We've seen several emails where
19	Q. And it says, "EUZ Automated	19	other people have said it's global that
20	Underwriting" under it, correct?	20	you're on, and you didn't ever say, no,
21	A. I do see that.	21	that's wrong, or correct those other
22	Q. Is it fair to say that you were	22	statements?
23	aware that Chubb International was one of	23	A. We haven't seen any anything to
24	Chubb's current Blaze projects in April of	24	that effect that I responded to any of those
25	2014?	25	emails.
1	Page 213		Page 215

## Russell Schreiber 1 CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY of 19/24/2018 Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Federal Insurance Company, et al.

	Fair Isaac Corporation vs. Fed	lera	al Insurance Company, et al.
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
2	We haven't seen a single response	2	time at Chubb and FICO?
3	to any of those emails, right?	3	A. Probably. Likely.
4	Q. Right.	4	I don't know, I don't know, I
5	A. We haven't seen any response, that	5	don't know. I just don't know. I just don't
6	they're correct or incorrect.	6	know.
7	Q. Right.	7	Q. You just don't know?
8	And so tell me, do you actually	8	A. I'm telling you you'll find that
9	recall ever responding to one of those emails	9	I'm probably the least of all the people
10	in any way, responding to a statement that	10	involved I have probably the fewest emails of
11	the Chubb ELA is global?	11	anyone in your in your discovery.
12	MR. HINDERAKER: Objection. Rely	12	I'm not a big email person.
13	on the record.	13	Q. So the question though is do you
14	A. So the only recollection I have is	14	actually have a specific recollection
	the email that you've shown me.	15	A. One way or the?
16	Q. Exhibit 57?	16	Q of ever sending an email that
17	A. Right. Is that the one that	17	says something to the effect of the Chubb ELA
18	says	18	is limited to the United States?
19	(Document review.)	19	A. I remember having very specific
20	A. Right. Exhibit 57 is the only	20	positions that it was.
	place	21	I can't tell you if I put in it an
22	Q. Okay. So we don't have	22	email or it was a phone call with Sawyer or a
23	MR. HINDERAKER: Did you get a	23	phone call with Brodie saying it's a U.S.,
24	chance to finish your answer?		U.S., U.S., U.S.
25	A. So Exhibit 57 is the only place	25	I just can't tell you if it was an
25	Page 216		Page 218
1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber	1	CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - Schreiber
	that I responded as to whether or not there		email or a phone call.
3	was a license.	3	Q. So let's go through all of those.
4	Q. A global license?	4	A. Okay.
5	A. Right.	5	Q. Okay? Because I just have to
6	Q. Okay. So we do not have any		create a record about what you actually
~	writing from you in connection with any of		remember and what you are guessing you may
	the emails on this topic indicating that you	8	have done.
9	believe the license is limited to the United	9	A. Okay.
	States, is that fair?	10	Q. So as I understand your testimony,
11	A. No, you haven't shown me any.	11	you don't have a specific recollection of
12	I'm not saying there aren't any.	12	ever sending an email saying that the Chubb
13	You haven't shown me any.	13	ELA is limited to the U.S. United States?
14	And what's kind of interesting	14	A. That's correct.
15		1	Q. Okay. You have written at least
1		115	G. Chav. Touriave willen arieasi
16	here it says, pull up the contract	15	•
16 17	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says	16	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?
17	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull	16 17	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of
17 18	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract.	16 17 18	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.
17 18 19	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract. Q. So we don't have any emails here	16 17 18 19	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.  But, yes, that's correct.
17 18 19 20	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract. Q. So we don't have any emails here today that we've looked at in which you have	16 17 18 19 20	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.  But, yes, that's correct.  Q. Okay. And you've been on other
17 18 19 20 21	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract. Q. So we don't have any emails here today that we've looked at in which you have said in writing the Chubb ELA is limited to	16 17 18 19 20 21	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.  But, yes, that's correct.  Q. Okay. And you've been on other emails that reference the ELA as being a
17 18 19 20 21 22	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract. Q. So we don't have any emails here today that we've looked at in which you have said in writing the Chubb ELA is limited to the United States, is that a fair statement?	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.  But, yes, that's correct.  Q. Okay. And you've been on other emails that reference the ELA as being a global ELA?
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract. Q. So we don't have any emails here today that we've looked at in which you have said in writing the Chubb ELA is limited to the United States, is that a fair statement? A. That's a fair statement.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.  But, yes, that's correct.  Q. Okay. And you've been on other emails that reference the ELA as being a global ELA?  A. Well, there's the Larry Wachs one.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract. Q. So we don't have any emails here today that we've looked at in which you have said in writing the Chubb ELA is limited to the United States, is that a fair statement? A. That's a fair statement. Q. Okay. Do you think you ever wrote	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.  But, yes, that's correct.  Q. Okay. And you've been on other emails that reference the ELA as being a global ELA?  A. Well, there's the Larry Wachs one.  Q. And Mike Sawyer one?
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	here it says, pull up the contract And even that one email that says it's global, I also say pull up the pull up the contract. Q. So we don't have any emails here today that we've looked at in which you have said in writing the Chubb ELA is limited to the United States, is that a fair statement? A. That's a fair statement.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	one email saying it is a global ELA, correct?  A. I did not have a recollection of that until you showed it to me though either.  But, yes, that's correct.  Q. Okay. And you've been on other emails that reference the ELA as being a global ELA?  A. Well, there's the Larry Wachs one.